

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE DISTRICT OF SOUTH CAROLINA

RECEIVED
USDC, CLERK, CHARLESTON, SC

Michael Mahaffey, #186794,

2008 FEB 21 P 3: 22

Plaintiff,

Civil Action No. 3:07-1520

v.


ORDER

Simon Major, Jr. and Officer
Pleasant,

Defendants.

This matter is before the Court upon the Plaintiff's pro se complaint, which alleges violations of his constitutional rights pursuant to 42 U.S.C. § 1983. By local rule, this matter was referred to a United States Magistrate Judge for preliminary determinations.

On January 31, 2008, Magistrate Judge Joseph R. McCrorey issued a report and recommendation ("R&R") analyzing the Plaintiff's complaint and recommending that the Court grant the Defendants' motion for summary judgment. Attached to the R&R was a notice advising the Plaintiff of the right to file specific, written objections to the R&R within 10 days of the date of service of the R&R. To date, no objections have been filed.



Absent timely objection from a dissatisfied party, a district court is not required to review, under a de novo or any other standard, a Magistrate Judge's factual or legal conclusions. Thomas v. Arn, 474 U.S. 140, 150 (1985); Wells v. Shriner's Hosp., 109 F.3d 198, 201 (4th Cir. 1997). Here, because the Plaintiff did not file any specific, written objections, there are no portions of the R&R to which the Court must conduct a de novo review. Accordingly, the Court hereby adopts the Magistrate Judge's R&R as the Order of this Court, and it is

ORDERED that the Defendants' motion for summary judgment (Doc. #24) is

granted.

IT IS SO ORDERED.



The Honorable Set Blatt, Jr.
Senior United States District Judge

February 21, 2008
Charleston, South Carolina

